



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/632,065	07/31/2003	Asif D. Gandhi	10-16-15-24	2044

7590 10/13/2006

Docket Administrator (Room 3J-219)
Lucent Technologies Inc.
101 Crawfords Corner Road
Holmdel, NJ 07733-3030

EXAMINER

HOLLIDAY, JAIME MICHELE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	2617

DATE MAILED: 10/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/632,065	GANDHI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jaime M. Holliday	2617

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 22 September 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

- (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: _____.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicants basically argue that Sarkar does not disclose "evaluating a reverse link loading by examining at least two resources within a first time period and broadcasting an availability of resources message in response to the evaluated reverse link loading. Examiner respectfully disagrees, because, although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Sarkar clearly shows and discloses various scheduling mechanisms for allowing a mobile station to transmit data on the reverse link. One class of reverse link transmission involves the mobile station making a request to transmit on the reverse link. The base station makes a determination of whether resources are available to accommodate the request, reading on the claimed "evaluating a reverse link loading by examining resources within a first time period." As previously stated in "Response to Arguments," it is inherent that this done within a finite period of time. A grant can be made to allow the transmission. This handshake between the mobile station and the base station introduces a delay before the reverse link data can be transmitted. For certain classes of reverse link data, the delay may be acceptable. Other classes may be more delay-sensitive, and alternate techniques for reverse link transmission are detailed below to mitigate delay (paragraph 71). The base station allocates a portion of the reverse link capacity to one or more mobile stations. A mobile station that is granted access is afforded a maximum power level. In the example embodiments described herein, the reverse link resource is allocated using a Traffic to Pilot (T/P) ratio. Since the pilot signal of each mobile station is adaptively controlled via power control, specifying the T/P ratio indicates the available power for use in transmitting data on the reverse link, reading on the claimed "broadcasting an availability of resources message in response to the evaluated reverse link loading," (paragraph 74). Sarkar further discloses that measurements of any signal or channel used in the system may be measured in the channel quality estimator 335 of a given embodiment. As described more fully below, power control channels are another example. In a base station 104 or mobile station 106, signal strength estimations, such as received pilot power can be made. Channel quality estimates may be used to determine whether up or down power control commands are required to drive either the forward or reverse link power to the desired set point, reading on the claimed "examining at least two resources," (paragraph 61). Applicants further argue that Examiner had not addressed each argument and that the present office action did not provide any reasons for rejecting claims 10 or 18. Examiner respectfully disagrees, because as cited in "Response to Arguments," Applicants argued two limitations and Examiner addressed both limitations with the prior art of reference as recited and clarified here. Also, please refer to page 9 of the present office action, and Examiner has rejections for claims 18 and 20. Therefore, Examiner maintains previous rejections in view of the response above.



ERIKA A. GARY
PRIMARY EXAMINER